



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON JAVAN.

The table of nations.—At one time it was thought sufficient to assign Genesis x in its entirety either to P or to J; but recent criticism would distinguish here the sources P and J, and the work of the Redactor who fitted them together. The division made is roughly as follows:—P = vv. 1-7, 20, 22-23, 31-32, and J = vv. 8-19, 21, 24-30, as given by Driver [*Introd. to O. T. Lit.* (1898), p. 14 f.]. The modern tendency for elaborate subdivision is well illustrated by the scheme of Holzinger [*Genesis* (1898)]. Of the P section given above he would ascribe the second half of ver. 1 to the second hand of J. In the J section he apportions vv. 16-18 a to a JE source. To R is allotted ver. 24. The remaining verses of the section are divided between a first and a second hand of J (p. viii).

At first sight it would appear as if such critical dissection had dealt a fatal blow at all belief in the unity and antiquity of this list of nations by resolving it into a number of fragments of different dates. This very disintegration, however, seems to furnish the best evidence for the original unity of the chapter. The remarkable dovetailing of the sections attributed to P and J makes it impossible to believe that both were not provided with tables, complete, and very similar if not identical¹, whilst the view now adopted by some scholars that P and J represent the work of "schools" of writers rather

¹ Thus P—Noah and sons, v. 1; Japheth, sons, grandsons, vv. 2-4; Ham, sons, grandsons by Cush (in part), vv. 6-7; Shem, sons, grandsons by Aram, vv. 22-23. J—Ham, grandson by Cush (Nimrod), v. 8, grandsons by Mizraim, vv. 13-14, grandsons by Canaan, vv. 15-18; Shem, descendants by Arpachshad, vv. 24-29.

than of individuals also tends to overcome objections based on the disparity of the dates of the sources. [Cf. *Commentaries on Genesis of Holzinger* (1898, pp. iv, vi; Gunkel (1901), p. lviii; Driver (1904), p. xvi.] Even if we accept the view widely held that J is of the ninth cent. B.C., whilst P belongs to the period of the Babylonian Captivity, we have still the curious fact to explain that what is presumably the *oldest* stratum in the chapter—i.e. references to Noah, Japheth, Ham, Shem, and their immediate descendants is attributed to the *latest* source (P). Other arguments might be brought forward for the antiquity of the list. The idea, here exemplified, that finds for a people a single progenitor, belongs to the infancy of the race [Gunkel, p. 79]. The names too are old and had long lost their original signification before they were incorporated in the P and J documents. The name Peleg (ver. 25 J) has alone called for the comment. Slight variations in the spelling of one or two of the names as given here and in the parallel list in 1 Chron. i would also seem to show that the copyists were dealing with unfamiliar names. Altogether it seems reasonable to suppose that this valuable historical table, either in the form of written record or oral tradition, could have existed as we have it, in its main features at least, at a time considerably prior to both P and J.

The scheme of its composition.—It has been repeatedly urged against the table of nations that no scientific basis of formation is discernible, that neither language nor race furnishes the guiding principle in its composition [cf. Guthe, *Kurzes Bibel-W.B.* (1903), p. 703]. Critics would seem to overlook the fact that a table constructed on any such basis would involve a scientific outlook entirely out of harmony with the simple narratives of the early chapters of Genesis. The table of nations was doubtless based on a system, but a system that accorded with the ideas of that early era in which it originated. Noah after the flood must have been regarded as in

possession of the then known world. At his death the territory belonging to him would fall to be divided amongst his sons¹. If the arrangement of the peoples in the list was based, as we may well suppose, on some rude world-chart of these early ages, three well-defined districts could have been distinguished. The hill-country formed a barrier to the north. The ancient geographer Eratosthenes, for instance, would appear to have looked upon the Taurus range as stretching in a straight line from Amanus to beyond Persia. South of this hill-district we have to the east the Mesopotamia plains, to the west Syria and Palestine. In between these is the desert. A district is assigned to each of the sons. The Mesopotamian plains and their extension southward are inherited by Shem. The northern hill-country and beyond falls to the lot of Japheth. The country extending southward from Amanus between the sea and the desert becomes the possession of Ham. That there were three distinct districts may have determined the number of Noah's sons. Holzinger, it may be noted, considers that P has in view purely a geographical division, and it seems clearly to be a territorial distribution that Josephus understands by this table. He differs from the Masoretic Text in introducing prescripts demarcating the territory occupied by the descendants of the sons of Noah². If Bloch's estimate of the Jewish historian as merely a clever

¹ Cf. on this point the Ethiopic *Kebra Nagast*, ed. Bezold (1905), p. 4—"Then Noah the righteous died, and Shem became king. . . . They (i.e. the sons of Noah) had, namely, divided the earth amongst themselves, and Noah had made them swear in the name of his God that they would not cross the bounds of their neighbours. . . ."

² Josephus, *Antiq.* I. 122 (ed. Niese (1896), p. 7). The sons of Japheth—οἱ ἀπὸ Ταύρου καὶ Ἀμάνου τῶν ὄρων ἀρξάμενοι προήλθον ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς Ἀσίας μέχρι ποταμοῦ Ταναΐδος, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἕως Γαδεΐραν. . . .

I. 130 (p. 7). The sons of Ham—οἱ δὲ Χάμου παῖδες τὴν ἀπὸ Συρίας καὶ Ἀμάνου καὶ Λιβάνου τῶν ὄρων γῆν κατέσχον, ὅσα πρὸς θάλασσαν ἐτέτραπτο καταλαβόντες καὶ τὰ μέχρι τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ ἐξιδιασάμενοι. . . .

I. 143 (p. 8). The sons of Shem—οἱ τὴν μέχρι τοῦ κατ' Ἰνδίαν ὠκεανὸν κατοικοῦσιν Ἀσίαν ἀπ' Εὐφράτου τὴν ἀρχὴν πεποιημένοι.

compiler be a just one [cf. *Quellen des Josephus* (1879), p. 52 f. ; cf. also Buchler, *Rev. des Étud. Juives*, XXXII, (1896), p. 199, and XXXIV (1898), p. 93], these additions of Josephus, as embodying still more ancient views, are of the greater value.

The site of Javan.—As son of Japheth Javan should properly belong to the Japheth district. In Gen. x the name appears along with Tubal and Meshech, and the same combination of names is to be met with in Ezek. xxvii. 13. Stade [*De populo Javan* (1880)] has argued against the common interpretation of Javan as Greece, or the Greeks. He contends that in the references belonging to the pre-Persian period Javan can only mean the Asia Minor Ionians. It is quite possible that Ionia may be the country referred to under the name Javan. This is the interpretation of Josephus [*Ant.*, I. 124, ed. Niese, p. 7], and is in accord with the theory of E. Curtius [*Die Ionier vor der Ionischen Wanderung* (1885)] that the original home of the Ionians was in Asia Minor. On the other hand, many Greek scholars hold that only at a comparatively late date were Ionian colonies established in this quarter. A compromise has been suggested by Bury [*Hist. Rev.* (1900), p. 288 ff.]. The name, he thinks, might have been there in Asia Minor before the Greeks came to settle, and that thence the name was carried back to the shores of Greece. It is possible that the name was not confined to the district known in later times as Ionia. In the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* [II, p. 53] we find the fragment of a geographical list emanating from Nineveh giving the names of the principal lands and cities along the Taurus. Here, sandwiched between Hi-lak-ku (Cilicia) and Mi-li-ti (Melitene on the upper Euphrates), there is mention of a land Ia-[a?]-na. Most unfortunately the second sign has been partially obliterated so that it cannot be read with certainty. Lenormant [*Journ. des Savants*, 1882, p. 484] seems, however, to have no hesitation in regarding this as a land Javanu. Between Cilicia and

Metilene may be said to lie also the well-known district Amanu of the Bab.-Assyrian records. This name is given as Am(v)-a-num as early as the time of Gudea [cf. *Keil-inschriftliche Bibliothek*, III, p. 36]. In the later Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions it appears as Ha-m(v)a-nu. With this word Amanu or Avanu we may compare the LXX^{ej} rendering of מֵאָנָה as *avav* in Gen. x. 2, 4). The reproduction of the Babylonian *m* by the Hebrew *wāw*, as also the interchange of *Ia* and *A* at the beginning of some proper names—e.g. Ialman, Alman, &c.—is commented upon by Delitzsch [*Assyr. Gramm.*, p. 97], so that מֵאָנָה might thus correspond exactly to Amanu. This would then bring Javan, Tubal, and Meshech together, arranged in the order named, and in a straight line.

From the Egyptian side we obtain information of a land Uān or Wān in this same neighbourhood. It would appear from the private inscription of Amen-em-heb that in the thirty-third year of Tahutimes III (1503–1449 B. C.) this officer took rich spoil in the highlands of Uān on the west of Khalubu (Aleppo) [cf. Fl. Petrie, *Hist. Egypt* (1899), II, p. 124; and Wiedemann (who takes Khalubu = Lebanon), *Aegypt. Gesch.* (1884), p. 350]. From this same land Tahutimes III in the twenty-ninth year of his reign proceeded south to Aratu (Arvad) [cf. Petrie, II, p. 113; Wiedemann, p. 345.] Amanu, Javan, Uān seem to have some sort of connexion with each other and with the neighbourhood indicated.

The sons of Javan.—The Masoretic Text gives the sons of Javan as Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim (Rodanim in 1 Chron. i. 5). Gen. x. 5 adds that from these were separated the אֲחֵי הַגִּיטִּים. It is not at all likely that this refers, as has been held, to all the sons of Japheth. If indeed the phrase אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי יֶפֶת should be introduced in this verse after the analogy of vv. 20 and 31, it would appear in its proper place after אֲחֵי הַגִּיטִּים. The meaning intended to be conveyed is evidently that from the *four* sons of Javan the isles were peopled.

(a) *Elishah*. There is an Elishah given as brother of Javan in the LXX renderings of Gen. x. 2 and 1 Chron. i. 5. The Hebrew is אֶלִישָׁה, whilst the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch has אֶלִישָׁה. The Greek codices have *Ελιστα*, except B, which has *Ελεισα* 1 Chron. i. 7, and *Ελεισαι* Ezek. xxvii. 7. The reference in Ezekiel is to the אֶלִישָׁה יִי which export purple.

In what quarter we are to look for Elishah is no easy matter to settle. The name, or similar names, seems to have been widely spread. Elishah has been sought for in regions far apart. as the following list will show.—(1) *Aeolians*—Josephus, Zonaras, Smith, Derenbourg, Frz. Delitzsch, Knobel, Bunsen. (2) *Elis* (NW. province of the Pelopon)—Bochart. (3) *Helos* (in Laconia)—Halévy. (4) *Hellas*—Targ. Jon. to Genesis, Volney, Lenormant. (5) *Coast of Greece*—Toy. (6) *Crete*—Sayce. (7) *Italy*—Targ. to Ezek., Dillman. (8) *Sicily*—gloss to Syncellus, Eusebius, Kiepert, Kautsch. (9) *Carthage* [Elissa = Dido]—Schulthess, Stade, Meyer, F. Brown, Kraetschmar, Winckler, Budde, Jeremias. (10) *Beyond the Straits of Gibraltar*—Jensen. (11) *Alashia*—Conder. (12) *Cyprus* (= Alashia)—W. M. Müller.

When there is so much diversity of opinion it must appear a vain task to support any single contention. The key to the solution will only be found when there is agreement as to the principle that obtained in the formation of the table of nations. But we may examine more closely the last two identifications, since these keep us in the neighbourhood of Asia Minor. Conder [*Pal. Exp. Fund, Quart. Stat.* (1892), p. 45] suggested that Elishah might be identified with the land Alashia of the Amarna Letters [*Keil. Bib.*, V, Letters 25-33]. In the *Orient. Litt.-Zeit.* [III, p. 288 ff.] Müller tried to show that these two names were etymologically the same. The main difficulty he has to contend with is the position of the yodh in the Hebrew word. Müller adduces the form *Ελεισαι* of LXX^B for the presence of the yodh in

the last syllable. But Ελεισαι is no doubt merely the plural form of Ελεισα, nor can justification be found for his arbitrary change of יִס into יֶס. The similarity of the names Elisha, Alashîa is too great, however, to be lightly passed over. We gather from the Amarna Letters that the land Alashîa was of considerable importance at that time (c. 14th cent. B. C.), and one might in consequence reasonably expect it to be included in the table of nations. Where is this Alashîa? According to Conder it is to be found on the south coast of Asia Minor, and according to Niebuhr [*Stud. u. Bemerk. z. Gesch. d. Alt. Orients* (1894), p. 97 ff.] to be identified with Ἐλέουσα [cf. Strabo, XIV, pp. 5, 6]. In support of this might be adduced the reading of the LXX which gives an Elishah as brother of Javan, and mentions them together. On the other hand, W. M. Müller [*Zeitsch. f. Assyriol.*, X, p. 257 ff.] identifies Alashîa with Cyprus, comparing it with 'si-y[*asiy(a)*]¹, the Egyptian (hieroglyphic) name for the island. The identification has met with considerable acceptance. If, however, Elishah be the same as Alashîa, and Alashîa be Cyprus, we should have Cyprus mentioned twice in the same verse, since Kittim also clearly means Cyprus. The difficulty might be met by saying that Alashîya may have been the name of a *part* only of the island. Pietschmann [*Gesch. d. Phönizier* (1889), p. 257, note 1] has made this suggestion with regard to Asiy—the Egyptian name. As helping to confirm this, it might be added that in the Amarna Letters we read of the "king of Alashîa," but when we come to the time of Sargon we learn that there are *seven* kings of Jatnâna (Cyprus). In the present state of our knowledge it seems, however, impossible to determine with any degree of certainty what land is meant by Elishah in the table of nations.

(b) *Tarshish*. The form תַּרְשִׁישָׁה which occurs in 1 Chron. i. 7 has evidently received its termination under the influence

¹ Viz. *a-si-y* = *assiy(a)* = *arsiy(a)* = *alsiy(a)*.

of the immediately preceding אֱלִישָׁה. The LXX renderings are *Θαρσεis* or *Θαρσιs* and even *Θαρσος* (so LXX^A in Ezek. xxvii. 25). In Isa. ii. 16 and xxiii. 6, 10, 14 Tarshish is translated *Καρχηδων* (or *Χαρκηδων* LXX^{B* & C*}),¹ also *Καρχηδονιοι* or *Χαρκηδονιοι* in Ezek. xxvii. 12, 25, xxx. 13. In the last of these passages we find a variant *Χαλκηδορος* (LXX^A). It is customary to associate Tarshish with *Ταρτησσός* in the south of Spain. The interpretation Carthage of the LXX is also that of Targ. Jonath.; cf. 1 Kings xxii. 48 and Jer. x. 9 [cf. also Winckler, *Alt. Orient. Forsch.*, I, p. 445 f.]. According to Josephus it is Tarsus in Cilicia. The *ת*, he explains, has become at a later time *ט*. This identification receives the support of Sayce [*Expos. Times* (1902), p. 179], also Baron and Bunsen. Jerome and Eusebius [*Onom. Sac.*] think of a region in India. Lepage Renouf [*Proc. Soc. Bib. Arch.*, pp. 104 ff., 138 ff.] would derive תַּרְשִׁישׁ from רֶשֶׁשׁ and find in the name a designation for coastland, more especially the Phoenician coast. In the *Orient. Litt.-Zeit.* [III, p. 151] it will be seen that Cheyne thinks of connecting תַּרְשִׁישׁ with the Tyrseni or Etruscans—a view first advanced by Knobel—but seems to have given this up in favour of an identification with a district Asshur (or Geshur) in North Arabia (cf. *Encyc. Bib.*). It can scarcely be said, however, that any of the explanations offered are very convincing. The identification with Tarsus in Cilicia as associating Tarshish with Asia Minor might be commended for that very reason, but there are obvious difficulties in connecting תַּרְשִׁישׁ with טַרְז, as the name appears on coins; and, indeed, as remarked before, until it can be established on what plan the table of nations was formed, it seems profitless to speculate as to both Elishah and Tarshish.

(c) *Dodanim* (or *Rodanim*). *Dodanim* is given in the Hebrew text as the fourth son of Javan in Gen. x. 4, but in 1 Chron. i. 7 the name given is *Rodanim*. The variants of this name are interesting. We find וֹרְדַנִּים in Gen. x. 4,

¹ * denotes original scribe of the MS.; ^a, ^b, ^c, 1st, 2nd, 3rd hands.

MT., Vulg.; in 1 Chron. i. 7, Vulg.: וִרְדָּנִים in Gen. x. 4, Samarit., LXX^E; in 1 Chron. i. 7, MT., LXX^B: רִדְנִים in Gen. x. 4, LXX^{AD}, in 1 Chron. i. 7, LXX^A. The evidence seems overwhelmingly in favour of the form Rodanim. With the form Dodanim the only name that seems to invite comparison is Dodona in the interior of Epirus; but as the אִי הַנְּיִם were to be separated from the sons of Javan we must surely look for a place in the neighbourhood of the sea. The reading רִדְנִים or רִנְנִים is suggested by W. M. Müller [*Or. Litt.-Zeit.*, III, pp. 288 ff.] in an article on the sons of Javan. He would in this way connect the name with a people of Western Asia Minor, known to the Egyptians as Da-no-na, possibly the same as the Da-nu-na of the Amarna Letters. The name Da-no-na has been before now identified with the Danai or Greeks. By such juggling with letters, however, anything might be proved, and the results dependent on such methods can scarcely be regarded as satisfactory. The reading רִרְנִים (Dorians) is advocated by Winckler [*Alt. Orient. Forsch.*, II, pp. 422 ff.]. The *Targ. Jer.* reads רִרְדָּנִים (Dardanians), a reading in which Schroeder [*Phönizische Sprache* (1869), p. 99] and Knobel [*Völkertafel*, pp. 104 f.] concur.

The most plausible reading is certainly רִרְנִים with the interpretation Rhodes. Against this identification it is urged that the Greek has the short ο, i.e. 'Ρόδος. It is just possible, however, that the termination *-im* may have been added under the influence of the preceding בָּתִּים. That such change could take place is instanced in this same verse as given in 1 Chron. i. 7. Here we have אֵלִישָׁה וְתִרְשִׁישָׁה. The effect of the juxtaposition of similar names no doubt explains also the variant אֵלִישׁ of the Samaritan Codex, where the second of the two names has evidently affected the form of the first. Josephus and LXX^{esp} omit the fourth son of Javan, although Josephus practically explains the reason of his omission when he adds to his comment on בָּתִּים, καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης (i.e. Χέθιμα) νῆσοι τε πᾶσαι καὶ τὰ πλείω τῶν παρὰ θάλασσαν

Χεθιν ὑπὸ Ἑβραίων ὀνομάζεται [*Antiq.*, I. 128, ed. Niese (1896), p. 7]. Such being the case it would of course be unnecessary to add Rhodes after Kittim. We know also that Epiphanius [*Adv. Haer.* xxx. 25] includes at least Rhodes under Kittim, so that it seems very probable that by כִּי־תִי־מִי we are to understand Rhodes.

(d) *Kittim*. The evidence of early writers is all in favour of identifying Kittim with Cyprus—thus Josephus, *Antiq.* I. 128 [Χεθιμά . . . Κύπρος αὕτη νῦν καλεῖται]; Zonar., *Epit. Hist.* i. 5 [Χεθίμ, ἡ Κύπρος αὕτη ἐστὶ]; Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.* xxx. 25 [δηλὸν ἐστὶν, ὅτι Κίτιον ἡ Κυπρίων νῆσος καλεῖται]; Hieron. *Des it. et nom.*, ed. Lagarde (*Onom. Sac.*, p. 113) [Terra Chethiim nam urbs hodieque Cypri Citium nuncupatur]; Hieron. on Gen. x. 4 [Cethim sunt Citii a quibus . . . urbs Cyprii Citium nominatur]; so also in similar terms, Hieron. on Isa. xxiii. 1, and Jer. ii. 10; Euchar., *Instr.*, II, 4 [Cethei, Citii, idem Ciprii, apud quos et urbs Cittium vocitatur]; Theodor. on Jer. ii. 10 [καλεῖ δὲ Χεττιεῖμ μὲν τὴν Κύπρον]; also Theod. in similar terms on Ezek. xxvii. 6; Isid., *Orig.*, ix. 2, 36 [Cethim a quot Citii, id est Cyprii]. For additional references cf. Oberhummer [Cypern, pp. 19 f.], Lenormant [*Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1883, pp. 234 f.]¹.

As already remarked the name כִּי־תִי־מִי was probably not limited to Cyprus. It has been connected by many with חִתִּים (Hittites), although Lenormant [*Rev. d. Quest. Hist.*, XXXIV (1883), p. 235, note 6] thinks that the evidence is insufficient. Schroeder [*Phöniz. Sprache*, p. 116], in contrasting the Hebrew and Phoenician languages, adduces this instance amongst others for the interchange of כ and ח, and Movers [*Phönizier*, II, 2, pp. 204 ff.] adduces evidence for an identification of the two names. That the names are identical is the firm conviction of Hitzig [*Zeitsch. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch.*, IX (1855), pp. 756 ff.] and

¹ The classical references to Cyprus have been brought together in Meursius, *Cypri* (1675), Engel, *Kypros*, 2 vols. (1842), and Oberhummer, *Die Insel Cypern* (1895).

W. Max Müller [*Asien u. Europa*, p. 345] shows that the names can be etymologically the same—that כתי (so in Phoenician inscriptions) being the same as Egyptian Khita (Ḥ-ta) and thus the same as the Assyrian Ḫatti and Hebrew חתי.

As the discussion has turned on the variants of the word Kittim given in the LXX, the renderings of the MT. (with the word preceding in brackets), the chief MSS. of the LXX (according to Swete, *O.T. in Greek*, 1887 seq.) and the Vulgate will be given in order.

Gen. x. 4: כְּתִים [וּתְרָשִׁישׁ]; Κητιοι A | Κιτιοι DE | ; Ceththim.

1 Chron. i. 7: כְּתִים [וּתְרָשִׁישׁ]; Κητιοι B | Κητιοι A*^{vid.} | ; Cethim.

Num. xxiv. 24: כְּתִים [מִיד]; Κιτιαίων BF | Κητιαίων A | ; Italia.

Isa. xxiii. 1: כְּתִים [מֶאֱרֶץ]; Κιτιαίων BNF | Κητιαίων A | Κιτιέων Q | ; Cethim.

Isa. xxiii. 12: כְּתִיִּים [צִירֹן] ('P = כְּתִים); Κιτιείς BQΓ | Κητιέμ A | ; Cethim.

Jer. ii. 10: כְּתִיִּים [אִי]; Χεττιέμ BAQ | Χεττιέων N | ; Cethim.

Ezek. xxvii. 6: כְּתִים [מֶאֱי]; ('P = כְּתִיִּים); Χεττιέων B | Χεττιέμ AQ | ; Italiae.

Dan. xi. 30: כְּתִים [צִיִּים]; Ρωμαιοι 87 Syr. | Κητιοι Theod. BA | Χεττιέμ Q* | ; Romani.

1 Macc. i. 1: [ἐκ της γης] Χεττιέμ ANV | ; Cethim.

1 Macc. viii. 5: Κιτιέων [βασιλεα] A | Κητιαίων N^{c.a} V | ; Ceteorum.

From the above it will be seen that the forms of the name beginning with X only occur where the Dagghesh Lene is absent from the כ—i.e. where the כ is aspirated by reason of the immediately preceding vowel sound, so that great importance cannot be attached to the forms with X in the LXX renderings given above. In Dan. xi. 30 we seem to have as exception the reading of the original scribe of Q. It is evident, however, that he has read צִי כְתִים, in any case the more natural reading. The word preceding the name in 1 Macc. i. 1 has been מֶאֱי (not מֶאֱרֶץ) in the

Hebrew original of the book, whilst in viii. 5 it was כִּי. There seems no reason to believe that the names כְּתִים and כְּתִים, however, were distinct. It is more probable that Kittim was the local or Phoenician pronunciation of the name. The name Kittim, indeed, seems rather to be the name of the inhabitants than of the island itself. In such case one wonders if it is not a contraction for כְּתִי כְּתִים—in some of the passages at least. The name Kittim would appear to have had a wider denotation in later times, as the interpretations Italia, Romani seem to show, but there is scarcely justification for the contentions of some modern scholars that Kittim is not Cyprus and must be sought for elsewhere [cf. Winckler, *Altorient. Forsch.*, III, pp. 422 ff.; Müller, *Orient. Litt.-Zeit.*, III, p. 288; Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament* (1904), p. 154, &c.].

It is clear that the dates of the references to כְּתִים in the O.T., and the references to Cyprus of the Assyrian records must of necessity overlap in one or two cases, so that a consideration of the cuneiform name for Cyprus may help to a decision. Assyrian scholars without exception agree that the name Jatnâna or Atnâna¹ denotes Cyprus. This name is most frequently met with in the inscriptions of Sargon [722-705 B.C.] often with Ja'—always as part of the expression Ja' nagî ša—preceding, viz. Ja' nagî ša (mat) Atnana [Annal. 383 (64)²; Stele II, 28 (180)]; Ja' nagî ša (mat) Jatnana [Pr., 145 (126); P.p., IV, 42 (148)]. Nagû is "district, territory," especially narrow territory, and ša is the pronoun used as relative, in its use corresponding much to Aramaic ܫܐ. According to Delitzsch [*Paradies*, p. 292] the form Atnâna occurs in all the bull inscriptions except that of Doursark [V, 38]. Without the

¹ Delitzsch [*Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 292] has pointed out that Jadnâna is a possible reading, and Winckler repeatedly uses this form of the word.

² The references are taken from Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons* (1889), vol. I. The numbers enclosed in brackets refer to the pages in this book. Pr. = Prunkinschrift, P.p. = Pavé des portes.

Ja' preceding the form of the name would appear to be always Jatnâna—viz. (mat) Jatnana [Saal, XIV, 17 (82), 22 (84); Pr., 16 (98); P.p., I, 7 (136), II, 4 (138), III, 5 (142), IV, 63 (150), V, 14 (158)]. The name appears again in the inscriptions of Sinaherib [705-681 B.C.], where we are told that Lu-li-i, king of Sidon [but cf. Joseph., *Antiq.*, ix. 14. 2] fled at the approach of the Assyrian to Jatnana [cf. G. Smith, *Sennacherib* (1878), pp. 67 f.; *Keil. Bib.*, II (1890), p. 90, note 12]. We meet with Jatnana in Aserhaddon (681-668 B.C.), where curiously he includes Cyprus in Hattiland [*Keil. Bib.*, II, p. 150], and gives a list of ten kings of the island who paid tribute to him. A similar list of tributary kings is given by Asurbanipal (668-626 B.C.) [cf. *Keil. Bib.*, II, p. 240].

With regard to the interpretation of the Assyrian expression, E. Schrader [*Keilinschr. u. Geschichtsforsch.*, pp. 243 ff.] conjectures that Ja' may have been a district in Cyprus, probably the great plain Mesaria. F. Lenormant [*Rev. d. Quest. Hist.*, XXXIV (1883), pp. 246 f.] would read *a* instead of *at*—i.e. Ja-a-na-na for Ja-at-na-na¹—with the slender support of two instances of such reading in the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, connecting the name with 'Iás, an early name for Attica, and making Ja-a [?Ja-'] the part of Cyprus colonized by the Ionians. Winckler's suggestion that Ja' nagî arose by false etymology on the part of the Assyrians from 'Iawukol [cf. *Keil. Sarg.*, p. xl, note 6] has been refuted by Oberhummer [*Cypern*, p. 8], who points out that 'Iawukol is not the name of the people, but an adjective. The presence of the guttural in Ja' is also a factor that must be taken into consideration.

The Hebrew phrase אֵי כְּתִים (so Ezek. xxvii. 6, Jer. ii. 10,

¹ So also Sayce, *P.S.B.A.*, 1902, p. 12. If 𐎶𐎵𐎶 = $ad(t, t)$ here represents \hat{a} —in any case a very rare reading and one we should scarcely look for in the Sargon inscriptions—we should reasonably expect a variant, say 𐎶𐎵 (a) or 𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵 (an), in one or other of the records. There are, too, obvious objections to seeing in both Ja' and (J)atnana, or even Ja-a-na-na, forms of the same name.

and presumably 1 Macc. i. 1) may, perhaps, furnish the clue to the Assyrian derivation. In this expression the voice stress is on the last syllable of the last word. The aspirated א having practically the sound h , there is reason to believe that the whole would be sounded in ordinary use very much like *îya chattîm*, since the tendency was to use with the guttural the *a* class of vowel. This *îya* would naturally be rendered *ia* in Assyrian. As a consequence of the intimate connexion between the construct state and the following noun, the guttural of the *chattîm* has become attached to the *ia*, making *ia-*, i. e. $\text{אֶיָּ} \rightarrow \text{אֶי}$. Such mistake on the part of the Assyrians would be perfectly natural since א is clearly a loan-word in the Semitic. The Assyrians have, however, been acquainted with the general meaning of the word, since they have added *nagû*, i. e. Ja-['] *nagû* = coast territory. The *Status Constructus* of the Hebrew is rendered by *ša*. Then follows *Atnâna* in the Assyrian to correspond to *attîm* in the Hebrew. Where we have *tn* in the Assyrian we find *tt* in the Hebrew, which might imply that there had been an assimilation of *n* in the Hebrew. There remains *âna* to identify with *îm*. The Hebrew plural termination is *îm* for masculine nouns, and one of the Assyrian plural terminations is *âni*. With a *na* sound preceding the final *ni* could very well become *na*, i. e. *na-na* instead of *na-ni*.

It may very well be objected that in dealing with proper names *îm* cannot pass into *âni*, or vice versa. The Assyrians would take down the name as it was spoken. We do not, however, argue that the Assyrians obtained the name from the Hebrews, but that both probably got it from the Phoenicians. We may in this connexion note that according to Josephus, the islands and the greater part of the coast-lands were called Χερσεύς by the Hebrews (not Χερσεύς) [cf. *Antiq.*, I, 128, ed. Niese (1896), p. 7]. Then again LXX^B in Ezek. xxvii. 6 translates Χερσεύς , and LXX^N in Jer. ii. 10 Χερσεύς . The difficulty, then, with regard to the

m and *n* is not so very serious, and we may at least suggest the equation

$$\text{Ja' [nagî ša] Atnâna} = \text{אֲתַנָּא כְּתִים}.$$

The form Jatnana¹ doubtless reflects the influence of the preceding *Ja* sound. In the lists given by Asarhaddon and Asurbanipal, the names of the places are not all certain, but at least six of them can be identified with coast towns, so that the seven kings of the Ja' nagî referred to in the Sargon records were doubtless all from the coast. Since Asarhaddon and Asurbanipal seem to include in their list names of places in the interior of the island, there is no occasion for them to make mention of the Ja' nagî, or coast district.

Javan in ancient records. Who were the Javanites? According to Pictet [*Les Origines Indo-Européennes*, I (1859), p. 58]: "On ne s'accorde pas ni sur l'origine de ce nom, ni sur sa valeur primitive, ni sur la manière dont il s'est transmis ou conservé chez les divers peuples." The only identification at present generally accepted is that Javan is the same as 'Ιάων [Iafow]. The Javanites are held to be Ionians, or even Greeks in general; for is it not the case that πάντας τοὺς Ἑλλήνας Ἰάοντας οἱ βάρβαροι ἐκάλουν, as the scholiast to Aristophanes, *Acharn.*, 106, asserts? In what follows an attempt will be made to show that, although in later times Javan evidently did denote the Ionians or Greeks as known to us, yet in its *valeur primitive* it denoted the traditional Phoenicians. We have also already indicated that Javan in the "table of nations" possibly did not mean Greece, but as the name of a *district* might be looked for somewhere in Asia Minor or Northern Syria. In early times the people Javan

¹ The *tn* in Jatnana is probably a transposition for *nt*. Ḫattu in cuneiform stands for Ḫantu (so Hommel, *Abriss*, 1889, p. 39). Interchange of consonants is by no means uncommon in proper names. It is no doubt relying on this fact that Hall, who reads Iantānay (or 'Antanay) as the hieroglyphic name of Cyprus, identifies his reading with the cuneiform Jatnān (*B.S.A.*, VIII, p. 167).

must have been widely known amongst the nations. References to this people are to be found in the records of India, Egypt, Israel, Assyria, Persia, Greece, and these we may now shortly consider.

(a) *India.* It is a matter of much regret that Indian chronology is in such an unsatisfactory state. Apart from internal evidence, Indian scholars seem to have little or no means of determining the dates of the older works. This is the more unfortunate as the mention of the Javana—such is the Sanskrit form of the name—has been in most cases used as an argument for fixing the date of the work in which it occurs. And it is customary to interpret Javana as “Greeks.” It is evident, however, that for the purpose we have in view the date itself of the work must be one of the most important means of determining whether Javana can possibly mean the Greeks. Could the Indians have had knowledge of the Greeks before the time of Alexander? It has been hazarded that the Indians could have acquired a knowledge of the Greeks from the Phoenicians. It is remarkable, however, that no one can point to a name for the Phoenicians themselves in Brahman literature [cf. Pictet, *Les Orig. Indo-Europ.*, I, p. 61]. Through the medium of Indian auxiliaries of Darius? Of such auxiliaries little, if anything, seems known. From the Persian interpreters of Alexander? [cf. Weber, *Ind. Antiq.*, IV (1875), pp. 244 ff.]. Already, at the time of Darius, the Persians knew the Javanites as Jauna, yet it is only when we come to the time of Açoka (3rd cent. B.C.) that we find a similar contracted form Jona in the Indian writings. Also long before Alexander the Greeks were already known as Ἑλλήνες.

One of the most important notices of Javana is that due to the “Father of Sanskrit Grammar,” Pāṇini [IV, 1, 49]. Since attempts have been made to use Pāṇini as a keystone to Indian chronology there has been keen discussion as to his epoch, and dates have been suggested for him ranging over a period of no less than 1,200 years. Those

students of Pāṇini's *Grammar* who found their conclusions on textual evidence alone appear to agree as to the antiquity of the work. Thus Goldstücker [*Pāṇini*, pp. 225-7], perhaps the greatest authority on Pāṇini, would place him at latest in the 7th cent. B. C., whilst Westergaard (*Ältest. Zeitraum Ind. Gesch.* (G. T., 1862), p. 72] concludes for about 400 B. C., and Liebich [*Pāṇini* (1891), p. 8] for a little later than Buddha. Those scholars again who favour a date towards the end of the 4th cent. B. C., or a little later, seem to have been influenced by Böhtlingk [*Pāṇini* (1840), II, p. xiii], who suggested a date about that time, relying on the evidence of Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* (12th cent. A. D.). The value of the latter testimony is now discounted [cf. Liebich, *Pāṇini*, p. 2]. A few scholars would assign Pāṇini to the 2nd cent. A. D. or even later. The main reason given for this late date is the appearance in Pāṇini's work of a form of the name Javana.

Javanânî is the form of the name that Pāṇini uses. He brings it in to illustrate a rule. At a later date in a commentary, the *Vārttika* of Kātyāyana, the explanation is given that by javanânî a species of *lipi*, i. e. writing or alphabet, is meant. Kātyāyana also gives Javanî as the ordinary feminine of Javana [IV, 1, 63]. What is the writing referred to under the name javanânî? Reinaud [*Mém. s. l'Inde* (1849), p. 88] argues that it is Greek writing, as also does Weber [*Ind. Stud.*, IV (1861), p. 89]. By Lassen [*Ind. Altertums. 2*, I, 2 (1866), p. 724] it is held to mean Aryan, while Goldstücker [*Pāṇini*, p. 16] considers it refers to the writing of the Persians, very probably the cuneiform. Müller [*Hist. Anc. Sansc. Lit.* (1859), p. 521] thinks it must be "that variety of the Semitic alphabet which previous to Alexander and previous to Pāṇini became the type of the Indian alphabet." There is here certainly no consensus of opinion that the Javana are Greeks and that javanânî is Greek writing. One point seems worthy of note. Pāṇini makes use of the word javanânî in his *Grammar* to illustrate a rule, and it is only natural to suppose that he would employ a word in

everyday use, or, if not, that he borrowed the term from one or other of the ten predecessors of whom he makes mention. Katyâyâna, between whom and Pāṇini a considerable interval of time must be placed, finds it necessary to explain javanânî, thus clearly showing that the term was then *going out of use*, or actually out of use. If by the Javana the Greeks were meant, we should reasonably expect the exact opposite. The Indians, too, could only have acquired a knowledge of Greek writing after the time of the Greek Bactrian King Demetrios, who first conquered Indian territory in 205 B. C. The majority of Sanskrit scholars, who have given an opinion on the subject, would place Pāṇini previous to this date. It is clear also that the Javana writing was well known prior to Pāṇini. Evidently here it is out of the question to hold that Javana is a name of the Greeks or Ionians. This is frankly acknowledged by Müller. "Javana is by no means the exclusive name of the Greeks or Ionians. Professor Lassen has proved that it had a much wider meaning, and that it was even used by Semitic nations. There is nothing to prove that Pāṇini was later than Alexander or that he was acquainted with Greek literature. . . . The Sanskrit alphabet, though it has always been suspected to be derived from a Semitic source, has not certainly been traced back to a Greek source. It shows more similarity with the Aramaean than with any other variety of the Phoenician alphabet" [*Sansk. Lit.*, p. 321]. Müller implies in his words that he believes the javanânî to have been a form of the Phoenician alphabet. He does not say that he believes the Javana to have been Phoenicians, but in very early times it was the Phoenicians who were especially associated with writing and letters. The Greeks themselves attributed the origin of this writing to the Phoenicians [cf. Herod., v. 58; Athenaios, *Dipnos*, A, 50 C; Diod., v. 74, 1; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, i. 16, 75].

Eloquent testimony to the antiquity of the name Javana is its appearance in the famous epic *Mahābhārata*. From

this epic we learn something of the Javanites themselves. Their wide knowledge and valour are lauded [VIII, 45, 2107]. In the twelfth book there is the description of a fight between Kṛiṣṇa and Kāla-Javana (dark Javana), and the taste of the Javana for single combats is also commented upon [XII, 101, 3739 ff.]. Wide knowledge has always been an asset of the traditional Phoenician, and no person, I think, would deny that he was exceptionally brave. The Kāla-Javana may have been so called from their swarthy complexion, and, according to Weber [*Hist. Ind. Lit.*² (E. T., 1882), p. 220, note], "at the time of the Daṣa-Kumāra the name Kāla-javana does in point of fact expressly designate a sea-faring people." In XIII, 33, 21-23^a; 35, 17-18, the Javanas are placed in the list of the degraded Kshatriya peoples, who had sunk to the condition of Śūdras on account of their omission of the sacred rites, and not consulting the Brāhmaṇas.

The book of the *Laws of Manu* [X, 43-4] furnishes an almost exact parallel to these last two passages of the *Mahābhārata*. Bühler [*Laws of Manu* (1886), p. cxiv] finds this mention of the Javana useful in fixing the date of the whole work. It is his opinion that the Javana are here the Greek subjects of Alexander's successors and especially the Bactrian Greeks. Lenormant [*Jour. d. Savants* (1882), p. 605] argues that the references to the Javana in the *Mahābhārata* are merely a proof of the late date of the recension that has come down to us. It has, on the other hand, been pointed out by Weber [*Ind. Lit.*², p. 187] that the Javanites are mentioned in that very part of the epic which is recognized as the oldest—i. e. that relating to the war on Hindustan soil.

In another epic, the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmiki, the name Javana is coupled with Çaken (Scythians) and Kamboja (Kābulis). On the request of Vaçishṭha the magic cow produces Scythians and Javanites, with whom the whole earth was filled. "They were gleaming, like unto heroes, and countless as the golden filaments of the lotus, and were decked out

in gold-like armour" [*Rāmāyaṇa*, I, 54, 18 ff.]. Discussing the date of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Menrad [*Rām.* (1897), pp. xxi, xxii] thinks of the 5th, 6th, or even 8th cent. B. C., and in his comment upon the word Javana, Schlegel [*Rāmāyaṇa*, I, 2, p. 169, note] expresses the opinion that "apud Indos vocabulum Yavana est antiquissimum."

We are on surer ground as regards date when we turn to the edicts of Aśoka Piyadasi. This king, who reigned in the 3rd cent. B. C., in his inscriptions on the rocks of Orissa and Gujerat, records his friendship with Antiyoko, the Jonâ-raja, or king of the Jona. The reference here seems to be to the Seleucid King, Antiochus II.

The wide knowledge of the Javana is lauded in the *Mahābhārata* as we have already seen. Indian astronomers, as Varāha-Mihira [cf. Lassen, *Ind. Altertumsk.*, I, p. 729; also *Zeitsch. f. Kunde d. Morgenl.*, IV, p. 335] continually speak of the Javana as their teachers. If Indian astronomers learned their astronomy from the Javana, there must have been a very early and intimate intercourse between the Javana and the Indians, for the name of Parâçara, reputed to be the oldest Indian astronomer, belongs to Vedic literature. Indeed, it would appear that there is a verse from Garga—reckoned the second oldest astronomer—often quoted, in which is extolled the astronomical knowledge of the Javana [cf. Weber, *Ind. Lit.*², p. 252]. It is clearly impossible to believe that the Greeks were the earliest teachers of the Indians. According to the generally accepted traditions, the Phœnicians instructed the nations in arts and sciences. Of commercial dealings between the Javana and the Indians we learn indirectly. In Kâlidâsa's *Raghuvança* [IV, 61] the women slaves of the Pârasikas (Persians) are called Javanî [cf. *Ind. Stud.*, XIII (1873), p. 308]. They may have been so called because furnished by the Javana. This seems to be corroborated by Indian inscriptions, in which Javana girls are specified as tribute [cf. Weber, *Ind. Lit.*², p. 251, note]. The Phœnicians were by all reputation slave-

dealers. Further, certain articles of trade which were dealt in, from all accounts, by the Phoenicians, are associated in Sanskrit with the word *javana*. Thus pepper is *javana-priya*; incense from Arabia is *javana*; tin is *javanêshṭa*—lit. “beloved of the Javana” [cf. Lassen, *Ind. Altertumsk.*,² p. 722]. And from the evidence furnished by these names Lassen regards it as possible that in its earliest meaning the word Javana included both Arabian and Phoenician.

One thing may be said to be certain, that Javana in the early Indian records is not the name of the Greeks. The only other race that would seem to possess the characteristics of these Javana are the Phoenicians. It must be acknowledged, however, that in the later Sanskrit writings the term Javana is clearly applied to the Greeks.

(b) *Egypt*. In the last lines of the Rosetta inscription it is prescribed that the decree be given in τοῖς τε ἱεροῖς καὶ ἑγχωρίοις καὶ Ἑλληνικοῖς γράμμασιν. The word corresponding to Ἑλληνικοῖς is in the *demotic* section *Uinn*, *Uinin*—the equivalent of the Coptic *Oueinin* (*Oueienin*), the only word in Coptic to express the name Greeks [cf. Mark vii. 26, Acts vi. 1, &c., in the Coptic version]. The corresponding *hieroglyphic* group would appear to be now read by Egyptologists *Ha-nîbu*, or *Hau-nîbu*. This name when first observed by Champollion and Rosellini [*Mon. Stor.*, III, 1, pp. 421–6] was read by them *Jounan* or *Jouni*. The phrase *Ha-nîbu*, as the hieroglyphic group is now generally read by Birch [*Gallery of Antiquities*, p. 89], “all the peoples of the north.” According to Lepsius [*Monatsb. Berl. Ak. Wiss.* (1855), p. 499 ff.] it was merely a faulty transcription of the name Ἰάοες. This view is combatted by Chabas [*Études sur l'Antiq. hist.*² (1873), p. 174], who contends that *Ha-nîbu* literally means “all those that are behind”—i. e. “all those that are to the north”—adding that the name was used as a designation for Greeks in the late epochs without quite losing its general significance, but that it was never used to transcribe the name of the

Ionians. By Lenormant [*Jour. d. Sav.* (1882), p. 607] *Ha-nîbu* is held to mean "all the Ha"—i. e. "all the shores and all the islands." He thinks that it corresponds exactly to the *הַיָּם הַגְּדוֹלִים* of Gen. x. 5.

The name appears as early as the time of the Pharaohs. On the monuments of some of the kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties [c. 16th–13th cent. B. C.] is found a list of nine peoples, in which are included the peoples of Upper and Lower Egypt. It would appear that the order in which the names are given represented the political positions of the peoples for the time being. At the time of Tahutimes III (c. 16th cent.) the *Ha-nîbu* headed the list. A century or two later the same people are placed last. The fact that the *Ha-nîbu*—if such be the correct interpretation of the pictorial signs—found a place on such a list, would seem to show that under this name there is reference to a single nation, and not to a group of peoples of indefinite number, as the translation of the term by Chabas, for instance, would seem to imply. Whatever be the meaning applied to *Ha-nîbu*, it is certain that this term became the later *demotic Uinn* or *Uinin*, and the Coptic *Oueinin*, the equivalent of *'Idoves*. Now it does not seem possible that either the Greeks or the Ionians could have been the foremost amongst the nations in the sixteenth century B. C. If modern scholars are to be believed, the Phoenicians were in possession of the shores and the islands about that time [cf. Pietschmann, *Phönizier*, p. 279 f.]. Lenormant's translation, "all the shores and islands," would indeed apply very happily to the traditional Phoenicians. Lepsius has busied himself with the name. He says it is clear that in the old monuments there can be no talk of the European or Asia Minor Ionians, or of the Greek races in their early homes, and he suggests as solutions of the problem either that the name was applied in the earliest period to a greater group of kindred peoples rather than to the single Ionian race, or that the Ionian race had in earlier times a much greater significance than

we have hitherto been able to gather from later history [*Monatsb. Berl. Ak. d. Wiss.* (1855), p. 507]. It is also acknowledged by Lenormant [*Jour. d. Sav.* (1882), p. 174] that "this word which the scribes at a later time made equivalent to the Greeks, certainly did not have that meaning in the epoch of the great conquests of the Theban kings," and Wiedemann [*Ältest. Bezieh. zw. Ägypt. u. Griechenland*] has reached the conclusion that only after the time of Alexander was the term applied to the Greeks.

The results gleaned from the Indian and Egyptian records respecting the Javanites present some parallel features. Both Indians and Egyptians would appear to have come into direct contact with this people. In both cases the early dates of certain of the references preclude the possibility of the Javanites being Greeks, or Ionians, as known to us. In both, the Javanites are associated with writing. In both, they are a people of considerable political importance. And in both cases the substitution of "Phoenicians" for "Javanites" in the earlier references would be perfectly suitable, since the Javanites, so far as revealed to us, possess characteristics which we have been accustomed to identify with the Phoenicians.

(c) *Persia*. The oldest Persian reference to the Javanites is to be found in the tri-lingual cuneiform inscription of Behistûn. The inscription dates from the time of Darius, so that we do not get beyond the sixth century B.C. The Persian form of the name is *Jauna*. Corresponding to this, we have in the inscription referred to, in the Medo-Elamitic *Javna*, and in the Bab.-Assyr. *Jam(v)anu*. Jauna is here described as a province of Darius. The name is introduced between Sparda and Mâda [cf. Spiegel, *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften* ² (1881), pp. 4, 5].

In the Persepolis inscriptions (also of Darius) Jauna is again mentioned. Thus we find in Naqsh-i-Rustam, a, l. 12:—"Sparda Y(13)aunâ tyaiy ushkahyâ utâ tya(14)iy darayahyâ," or, "Lydians, Javanites of the continent and of the sea"; also l. 28:—"Katapatu'ka, Sparda, Yaunâ, Saka

tyaiy ta(29)radarayâ sk'udra, Yauna takabarâ putiy." The "Yauna takabarâ" is translated by Spiegel [p. 55], "the Ionians who wear crowns" [cf. also Spiegel, pp. 119, 219]. Lenormant [*Jour. d. Sav.* (1882), p. 485] recalls the phrase κάρη κομώοντες Ἀχαιοί which occurs so frequently in the *Iliad*.

It has been recognized that here only the Asia Minor Ionians can be referred to, and not the Greeks. The Persian references are, however, too meagre and of too late date to be of much use.

(d) *Assyria*. Turning to the Assyrian records we find that here too the name crops up. The Javanites are mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions of Sargon (722-705 B.C.). Azuri, King of Ashdod, as it would appear, had refused to pay tribute to Sargon. He also incited other kings in his neighbourhood to rebellion. Sargon accordingly deposed him and appointed Ahimiti, his "true brother," king in his stead. The Hatti dethroned this new ruler. In his place they set up a certain Jamani (var. Jatna) one who had no claim to the throne, "who was as they" and had no respect for Sargon's rule. Sargon at once started on a punitive expedition. The Jamani made a hasty flight toward the Egyptian frontier. The Egyptian king, however, surrendered him to Sargon [cf. Wiedemann, *Ägypt. Gesch.*, p. 584]¹.

The variant Jatna is met with in Annal. 220 (36). Elsewhere we find the form Jamani—i. e. Saal XIV, 11 (82); Pr. 94 (114), 101 (114); Asd. Insc. 18 (186), 40 (188). Jamani, or Javani as it may also be read, is not, as has been argued by some scholars, a race-name used as the name of an individual, as, e. g. the word French used as a surname in England. In these inscriptions of Sargon the word Jamani is preceded by the single upright wedge. It is very probable that the idea of "a certain Javanite"

¹ Winckler [*Keil. u. d. Alt. Test.*, p. 72] argues that he was given up to Sargon by Pir'u (פירע), king of Yemen, as in the name Jamani he would see a "native of Yemen."

is thus intended to be conveyed. In the same text names of persons are preceded by the determinative ideogram *amelu*. Who was this Javanite? McCurdy [*Hist. Proph. and Mon.*, I, p. 416] conjectures that he was one of the Greek immigrants who probably formed an influential part of the community in Ashdod, and that the Ḥatti were the people of Palestinian origin. There is, however, absolutely no evidence for a Greek immigration at this period. Winckler [*K. A. T.*³, p. 72, but cf. also p. 70, note 1] argues that the Jamani was a native of Yemen, and suggests that *pa-ti* should be read instead of Ḥat-ti—i.e. *pa* for *Ḥat*. He would translate *pa-ti* as “abandoned men,” connecting the word with פתה [cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. HWB.*, p. 533—only one instance]. It is highly improbable that such reading could have been intended, as elsewhere in the same connexion we have the name given in the fuller form Ḥa-at-ti [Pr. 95 (14)].

We find further mention of the Javanites elsewhere in the Sargon inscriptions. Sargon records the dragging forth of certain Jamnai who “dwell like fish in the midst of the sea” [pp. 34 f. (148), Saal XIV, 15 f. (82)]. Various explanations of the name Jamnai have been offered. Cheyne [*Ency. Bib.* (Javan)] finds here the only express reference to the Ionians in the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions. Delattre [*L'Asie Occid. dans l. Inscr. Assyr.* (1885), p. 84] suggests connecting the name with 'Iavvā (mod. Jebna) in the neighbourhood of Joppa. The variant Jatna had led to the suggestion that *Jamnai* may have been a general designation for the inhabitants of Cyprus [cf. Hommel, *Gesch. Bab. u. Assyr.*, p. 703, note 3], or may have been the race-name of the Cyprians proper [cf. Oberhummer, *Cypern*, p. 87].

It is, however, difficult to believe that Sargon here refers to the Cyprians or to Cyprus. That he drew forth [נִסַּח] the Javanites like fishes suggests that their island home was a small one, and probably within easy reach of the mainland. If we accept the testimony of ancient geo-

graphers, Cyprus in early times was densely wooded [cf. Strabo (who quotes Eratosthenes), xiv. 6. 5], and would have afforded abundant cover for refugees. The Cyprians also could have early notice of Sargon's approach, and under such circumstances the "take" of the Assyrian king would have been small. Sargon, moreover, has no occasion to speak in such fashion of the Cyprians, since he refers to Jatnana only a few lines further down. It is probable that Sargon's reference is to the Phoenicians who had settled in Arvad (mod. Ruâd), a small island about 1,600 yards in circumference. It is close to the mainland. On the latter are the ruins of an older settlement [cf. Kiepert, *Ancient Geography* (E. T. 1881), p. 102 f.; Pietschmann, *Phönizier*, pp. 36 ff.]. According to Eusebius, *Chron. Armen.* [ed. Anchar, II, p. 172 f.], the island town was founded in 761 B. C., and according to Strabo [xvi. 2. 13 f.] the founders were refugees from Sidon. If the date here given of the founding of the island settlement be correct, the little colony had been scarcely forty years in existence when Sargon came to the throne, and it might as yet have had no special name to distinguish it from the Arvad on the mainland. Consequently Sargon could very naturally describe the new colony as "the Phoenicians who dwell in the midst of the sea." The notices of Arvad previous to this date can very well be taken as referring to the older town on the mainland. There may, of course, have been a settlement on the island before the Phoenicians took possession. It is certainly significant that Asurbanipal speaks of Jakinlû, King of Arvad, "in the midst of the sea, who like a fish had made his dwelling in the boundless waters" [cf. Smith, *Assurbanipal* (1878), p. 75; *Keil. Bib.*, II, p. 170, note 2], words that bear a remarkable resemblance to those of his illustrious predecessor concerning the Jamnai. There would appear, moreover, to be no mention, by name, of Arvad in the Sargon inscriptions.

Of the Javanites' connexion with Sinaherib (705-681 B. C.) we learn indirectly. Through Berosus [*Berosi Fragm.*,

ed. Müller, 12] we have word of a conflict between Sinaherib and "Ionians," who had landed in Cilicia. The "Ionians" were beaten back. Rawlinson [*The Five Great Monarchies*, II (1864), p. 453], and Schrader [*Keil. u. Alt. Test.*², p. 81] think that these must have been Cyprian Greeks. The name further appears in the Assyr. Bab. version of the rock inscription of Behistûn—Ja-ma-nu ša-nu-tu ša ma-gi-du[?]-ta ina [kakḫadi-šu-nu na-]šu-[u], i.e. "other Javanites who wear a *magiduta* (whatever that may mean) on their heads."

(e) *The Old Testament*. In Gen. x. 2, 4, 1 Chron. i. 5, 7, the LXX reads Ἰωάν, or variations of this form, for the MT. reading יָוָן. In Ezek. xxvii. 19, where we have יָוָן in the Hebrew text, the LXX has οἶνος, and the Vulgate Graecia. Elsewhere the LXX renders יָוָן by Ἑλλας, or Ἑλληνες.

As the result of his investigations Stade [*De Populo Javan* (1880)]¹ has come to the conclusion that only after the Persian period is it possible to render Javan of the Old Testament by "Greeks." Two classes of references are in consequence now distinguished by scholars. In Gen. x. 2, 4, 1 Chron. i. 5, 7, Isa. lxvi. 19, Ezek. xxvii. 13 (Joel iii. [iv.] 6, Zech. ix. 13) Javan is held to mean Asia Minor Ionians, but in Dan. viii. 21, x. 20, xi. 2 (Joel iii. [iv.] 6, Zech. ix. 13) the Greeks.

The Javan of Gen. x. 4 [1 Chron. i. 7] would seem to represent not a colony, but a motherland. There are four "sons" of Javan. Is it possible then to represent it as a Greek colony in Asia Minor? Each of the four "sons" has, moreover, been identified with Phoenician settlements [cf. Kiepert, *Monatsb. Königl. Pr. Ak. d. Wiss.* (1859), p. 214]; Budde, *Urgeschichte* (1883), p. 319, note 2], but in the uncertainty that exists with regard to these names, we cannot assume that the "parent" Javan must be Phoenicia. Stade recognizes that he is here confronted with a difficulty.

¹ Reprinted in Stade, *Akademische Reden und Abhandlungen* (1899), pp. 125 ff.

He contends that the "sons" of Javan as inhabitants of islands and coast lands were on the same footing as the Ionians. They were, however, specially designated "sons" because they fell short of the Ionians in power and wealth. Such an explanation is very obviously unsatisfactory.

Of the Javanites the O.T. does not give us very much information. From Ezek. xxvii. 13 we gather that the Javanites are traders. They deal in slaves. As slave-dealers, it may be remembered, the Phoenicians were notorious [cf. Pietschmann, *Phönizier* (1889), p. 280; Movers, II, 3, pp. 70-86]. As early as Homer they appear in this capacity [cf. *Od.* xii. 372 f., xv. 472 f.]. From this same passage we further learn that Javan has a trade in vessels of brass—also a special industry of the Phoenicians [cf. Movers, II, 3, pp. 65 ff.]. The reference in Isa. lxvi. 19 helps us but little. To Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, to Tubal and Javan, to the isles that are afar off, Yahveh will send "such as escape" of his enemies. Here Javan is closely associated with the "isles afar off," but clearly much cannot be made of this, which after all may be only coincidence. The passage in which Javan occurs in Zechariah [ix. 13] is a little more specific. Here the captive Israelites (Ephraim and Judah) are invited to return, when Yahveh will rouse them to victory over בנין יון. Javan here clearly cannot mean Greece. Why should the Israelites be stirred up against "thy sons, O Greece?" To obviate the difficulty Cheyne [*Ency. Bib.* (Javan)] has made the suggestion that the scribe wrote בנין יון inadvertently for בני ארם. To other scholars, again, the manner in which "Greece" is here mentioned has proved a "grave obstacle" [cf. Driver, *Introd.*, p. 349] in assigning a pre-exilic date to Zechariah, although the evidence for an early date is otherwise strong. Marti [*Dodecapropheton* (1904), p. 396] thinks here of the Seleucid conquest, and a settlement by them in Syria between 197 and 142 B.C. If the בנין יון were taken to mean Phoenicians, the difficulties tend to disappear. It would be quite natural that the Israelites should be stirred

up to a victory over a people in their immediate neighbourhood. In Joel iii. [iv.] 6 "Tyre, Sidon, and all the regions of Philistia" are depicted as selling the children of Judah and Jerusalem to the בני יונים. Here our identification would seem to break down, as Tyre and Sidon, Phoenician cities, are described as selling to the בני יונים. Had, however, the Javanites been here intended the expression would have been not בני יונים, but בני יון. It is just possible that in בני יונים we have a term in use at that time for "traders" or "slave-dealers." The Daniel references, viii. 21 (מֶלֶךְ יוֹן), x. 20 (שָׂרִיִּין), xi. 2 (מַלְכוּת יוֹן) furnish little information. Here Cheyne would find a reference to the Graeco-Macedonian Empire, "an expansion of the original conception which identified Javan with the important colonies of Asia Minor."

Whatever be the correct interpretation of Javan in the Old Testament, it is at any rate certain that it does not mean the classical Greeks. Javan must be sought in Asia, not in Greece or amongst the islands of the Aegean. To attribute to Javan the meaning of Asia Minor Ionians is to attach to the Ionian colonies in Asia more importance than they seem entitled to have. Such meaning quite breaks down when applied to Javan in the "table of nations." Yet here, as in the Indian and Egyptian records, we note the curious fact that, although Javan cannot possibly mean Greece or the Greeks in the earlier notices of the name, yet in later ages it seems to have had unquestionably that meaning. The Greek translators of the Old Testament concur in rendering Javan by Ἑλλάς or Ἑλληνες, and in Talmudic literature it means unquestionably the Greeks.

How then are the Javanites so intimately connected with the Greeks? We have seen that the Javanites possess those characteristic features with which tradition has endowed the early Phoenicians. Is the history of these Javanites the early history of the Greeks? Is it possible that the Greeks, or say the Ionian race, owed to their own ancestors that culture which they later developed, and

whose origin they attributed to the Phoenicians? Can we, in fact, trace any close connexion between the Ionians and the Phoenicians?

(f) *Greece.* The Javanites are known in Greek literature as *Ἰάδωες*, recognized as a contraction from *Ἰάδφοες*. We may approach a discussion of the early *Ἰάδωες* without misgiving, since we have an adequate treatment of the subject by E. Curtius in his brochure *Die Ionier vor der Ionischen Wanderung* (1855). Curtius is one whose scholarship can scarcely be called in question. It will be here sufficient to bring together some of the results of his investigations as set forth in his essay.

Curtius shows that the Ionians were a seafaring people whose settlements were to be found in all quarters of ancient Greece, but everywhere on the sea-coasts, on islands and promontories, in bays and straits, and at the mouths of rivers [p. 4]. In mental attainments they were closely related to the Phoenicians, and in many places were no doubt related to them by blood [p. 13]. They were the pupils and successors of the Phoenicians in their sea-routes. They acquired the arts and industries of their teachers, and knew how to make them their own. They it was who gave the name *Φοίνικες* to the Canaanites, and *Φοινίκη* to their settlements, many of which subsequently fell into their hands. They took over from the Phoenicians the trade in Grecian waters, and introduced there the knowledge of the East. They were the founders of the wine trade in the Archipelago, and spread through all Greece the fame of the Byblos wine. They planted the date-palm (*φῶινιξ*) in Delos and Aulis. Like the Phoenicians, they caught the tunny-fish, and established in many quarters purple-fisheries and the purple trade [p. 14]. They appear as the spreaders of the Syrian cults. They were often confused with the Phoenicians, and, in the earliest traditions of the western Greeks, are identified with them [p. 15]. "Cadmus is a name which—be its origin what it may—was at home in Ionia from the earliest times" [p. 26].

The theory of Curtius is that only in Asia Minor could the Ionians have had an opportunity of developing their national characteristics before scattering amongst the islands and shores [cf. *Griech. Gesch.*⁶ (1887), I, p. 29]. From the description given by Curtius of the early Ionians it is not easy to see where the Phoenician stops and the Ionian begins. There would appear to be no break. The Phoenician is merged in the Ionian. Indeed, as Renan [*Hist. Génér. d. Langues sémit.*⁵ (1878), I, p. 44] remarks, "M. Ernest Curtius dans son *Essai sur les Ioniens* semble avoir établi que le nom des Phéniciens couvrit en réalité des migrations de peuplades ioniennes vers l'occident."

Here, then, the Javanites and the Phoenicians are associated in the closest possible manner. They are practically identified. We have tried all along to show the possibility of such an identification; but here we seem to be on firmer ground. Yet if the Javanites or Ionians were of the same origin as the Phoenicians, how do we account for the different names? How do we account for the difference of language, or for the Greek traditions that made the Phoenicians a distinct race? These, and similar questions, very naturally call for an answer.

Phoenicians and Javanites. — Stephanus Byzantinus shows in one or two passages the close connexion between Javan and Phoenikē. Thus: Ἴος, — νῆσος τῶν Κυκλάδων, ἀπὸ Ἰώνων οἰκησάντων . . . ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Φοινίκη ἢ Ἴος [cf. also Pliny, *H. N.*, iv. 12 to the same effect]. Also Γάζα — πόλις Φοινίκης, νῦν δὲ Παλαιστίνης, . . . ἐκλήθη δὲ καὶ Ἰώνη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰοῦς. He also states that the sea between Gaza and Egypt was called Ἰόνιον.

The notes that follow will be as brief as the nature of the subject will permit, and for the most part of a general character.

According to the view mostly favoured by scholars at the present day, the Phoenicians entered Canaan as part of a great Semitic migration from Arabia at about 2500 B.C. Phoenician inscriptions in a language closely akin to Hebrew afford the main ground for believing the Phoe-

nicians were Semites. It is, however, notorious that these inscriptions are of comparatively late date. Thus Lidzbarski [*Nordsemitische Epigraphik* (1898), p. 118] thinks that of the seven inscriptions found in Phoenicia itself, none is older than the fifth century B.C., and that, of Phoenician inscriptions from all quarters, the oldest does not go further back than the seventh century B.C. All then that we are justly entitled to conclude from these inscriptions is that the Phoenicians made use of a Semitic language after about 1000 B.C.

There are good reasons why we should be careful to go no farther on the point of language than the facts warrant. It has been repeatedly held before now that the Phoenicians were originally of a non-Semitic race, and for some reason or another changed their language after settlement in Canaan. The Phoenician character, too, is so unlike the Semitic. We cannot do better than quote the words of so good an authority as Renan. "Since the Phoenicians spoke a Semitic language, the linguist is of necessity driven to conclude that they were themselves Semites. Here grave difficulties, however, present themselves to the historian, and cause him to suspend judgment on the real origin of this people which has played so important a part in the history of civilization. To begin with, the Hebrews firmly repudiated all relationship with Canaan, and attached him to the family of Ham. The critic is almost tempted to be of their opinion. As we pointed out before, the Semitic character knows neither industry, nor *esprit politique*, nor municipal organization. Navigation and colonization were foreign to it. The Semitic sphere of action remained purely oriental, only entering the current of European affairs indirectly. Here, on the contrary, we find an industrial civilization, political revolutions, the most active commerce known in antiquity, a nation ceaselessly spreading its influence abroad, and helping to shape the destinies of the Mediterranean world. In religion, too, the same contrast! In place of the stern monotheism, so characteristic

of the Semitic peoples, we find amongst the Phoenicians a mythology of the grossest description, base and ignoble deities, lust exalted into a religious rite. . . . Indeed, if invited to select from amongst the ancient peoples that one whose character presents the greatest contrast to the Semitic, we would be tempted to name the Phoenicians" [*Hist. Génér. d. Langues sémitiques*⁵ (1855), p. 173 f.].

Much has been added to our knowledge of the early eastern world since Renan wrote these words. Now we require to depend for our information less on Greek writers. The researches of the Assyriologist and Egyptologist have furnished us with evidence older, more complete, and more trustworthy. Light can thus be brought to bear on Phoenicia from all sides, and we would naturally expect to learn more of these marvellous traders, whose fame has been so sounded by Greek trumpets. Yet, as Pietschmann rightly observes: "Among the nations, on whose history scarcely any light is thrown by the great discoveries resulting from researches into the ancient monuments of the East, must be placed the Phoenicians" [*Phönicier*, p. 4]. This fact would seem to indicate, if anything, that the Phoenicians did not play so important a part in the early world as Greek writers would lead us to believe. Phoenicia herself has supplied very little material for her own history. The only documents of importance originating there are the letters in cuneiform character from the Phoenician towns to the Egyptian king, Amenophis IV. These tablets, which belong to the Tell-Amarna group, give us a valuable insight into the conditions then existing in Phoenicia. We find little in these letters to indicate that the Phoenicians were Semites. It is now established that Babylonian was the diplomatic language of the period. That the Phoenician petty princes made use of it proves nothing. The excavations carried on at Boghaz-Kevi for the last two summers have furnished results that make it almost certain that the main element of the population of Phoenicia was Indo-Germanic at this period.

There has always been a delightful vagueness about the Phoenicians, what they did, and what they were capable of doing, and of this uncertainty full advantage has been taken before now by many scholars. The theorist has often found it convenient to bridge a gap in his theory by means of the magic word Phoenicians. But, touching the Phoenicians, we find ourselves face to face with numerous difficulties. The Phoenicians, for instance, are represented as having been above all a seafaring nation. Yet their coast-land is peculiarly devoid of good harbours. None are large, and none afford complete protection from the west wind [cf. Pietschmann, *Phön.*, p. 31]. This fact of itself is no argument against the possibility of resolute seafarers developing here an extensive commerce. It is, however, a very strong argument against a pastoral people entirely changing their mode of life, and taking to the sea for a livelihood. Yet this is what we are asked to believe if we acquiesce in the modern view that the Phoenicians came originally from the Arabian desert. If the land on which they had settled were barren and unfruitful, and even if it were furnished with sheltered bays, or deep rivers, we might acknowledge that there was some inducement for the new settlers to alter their habits. But Phoenicia presented an uninviting coast-line, and was, moreover, a fruitful land—"one of earth's most productive gardens, emphatically a 'good' land, that might well content whosoever should be so fortunate as to possess it. There is nothing equal to it in Western Asia" [so Rawlinson, *Hist. of Phoenicia* (1889), p. 28]. To whatever race the people belonged who developed a world-wide trade from that unsheltered coast, they certainly could not have been tyros in things nautical on their first settlement there.

Again, we are told the Phoenicians traded from island to island and established colonies in all parts of the Mediterranean. For their earliest trading ventures they sought the Aegean and the shores of Greece. How then did it come about that the colonies in Greek waters, presumably the oldest and most firmly established, disappeared so

completely as to leave practically no trace of their former existence, whilst those of Carthage, Sicily, &c., flourished and developed? The Phoenicians, it is answered, were driven from their settlements by the Greeks. If so we should surely have some echoes in Greek history of such conflict. It is difficult to believe that Greek tradition would have remained silent on this most momentous struggle. If, on the other hand, instead of engaging in conflict, the Greeks had settled down alongside the Phoenicians, learning what they could of their methods, and gradually absorbing their colonies, the Greek language must inevitably have reflected such contact in a wealth of Semitic words. This is, however, not the case. Another explanation is sometimes offered. It is suggested that the Phoenician settlements were in reality mere trading stations. Those in Greek waters were absorbed by the Ionians, whilst those in Cyprus and the Western Mediterranean developed into colonies. This suggestion has received the attention of v. Landau [*Ex Oriente Lux* (1905), I, 4, p. 11 f.], who shows convincingly that trading-stations of themselves can never develop into colonies. To establish a colony there must be conquest and settlement of people. Such an extensive colonization as has been ascribed to the Phoenicians could only have been effected after long centuries of development and continual intercourse between the mother-country and her colonies. It has been argued that the Phoenicians were driven to take to their ships and settle amongst the islands to escape from their enemies; but such an argument can scarcely be taken seriously. For the great colonial undertakings of the Phoenicians nothing short of a powerful, free, and united motherland could have sufficed. The Amarna letters make it clear that at the very time when Phoenicia might reasonably be supposed to be engaged in founding and developing her colonies, her cities were crushed under the heel of Egypt, and were vying with each other in expressions of servility to the Egyptian monarch. When, indeed, in early times was Phoenicia

powerful? With Babylon on the one side and Egypt on the other Phoenicia was between two mill-stones, and it is difficult to find a time when the cities of Syria and Palestine were free from oppression. Assuredly the oppression of the Assyrian and the Egyptian left little scope for development. Nor was Phoenicia even united. There was no central authority. The land was divided into a number of independent townships. Concerted action for any length of time would be out of the question. Further, even if Phoenicia had the power to conquer, had she ever population enough to send forth to these colonies? This problem becomes still more acute if we have to think of single towns establishing these colonies instead of a united land. Indeed, the whole question of Phoenician colonization presents so many difficulties that Winckler [*Vorderasiatische Gesch.* (1905), p. 4] and v. Landau [*Ex Oriente Lux*, I, 4 (1905), p. 25 f.] agree in thinking that Carthage did not obtain its Semitic population from Phoenicia at all. They regard it as probable that the Semites made a lodgement there in the course of the same migration that brought them to Phoenicia, and that Carthage had a great deal to do with the colonization of the western Mediterranean. Further, to allow that the Phoenicians possessed mere trading-stations does not make the difficulties disappear. They must then have been entirely at the mercy of the nations, oftentimes savage, amongst whom they traded. To preserve trade under such conditions the Phoenicians must have been fair and honest dealers, and masters in the art of diplomacy. Rawlinson believes that such was the case, and introduces "adaptability" as a special feature of the Phoenician character [*History of Phoenicia*, p. 58 f.]. On the other hand, to believe the ancients the Phoenicians were by no means open and above board in their dealings.

Again, to the Phoenicians the Greek writers were almost unanimous in attributing the invention of the alphabet. Modern criticism sees in the so-called Phoenician alphabet

no invention, but the result of a long process of development. The alphabet has been evolved from an early system of picture-writing. Viewed as a stage in the process of development the alphabet of the Phoenician inscriptions may be said to come near the end, since the evolution has naturally tended towards simplification. This has implied reduction in the number of symbols used, as well as modification of the individual signs. If we are to believe the various expert critics who have busied themselves with the subject, the Babylonian, Hittite, Cretan, Cypriote, early Greek, and Phoenician characters are inter-connected, if one may use the term. The discovery of new Hittite monuments is adding rapidly to the number of Hittite signs. Omitting Cretan and Hittite, and arranging the others in order according to the number of signs possessed, we find the order is Babylonian, Cypriote, early Greek, Phoenician. It is rather remarkable that the early Greek alphabet possessed more signs than the Phoenician. If the alphabet be the result of development, the early Greek alphabet must have preceded the Phoenician in point of time. Even if the old view that the Phoenicians invented the alphabet be maintained, the Greeks must be held to have supplemented the alphabet they obtained from the Phoenicians by signs of their own. Had the Phoenicians, however, been inventors of the alphabet it is only reasonable to expect that the names given to the letters would be Semitic. Taking the Hebrew names of the letters as closely approximating to the Phoenician, we find that **הא, וין, חיה, טיה, צרי, קרי, תו** cannot be brought under known Semitic roots [cf. Bevan, *Ency. Bib.* (art. *Writing*)]. The name **י** occurs only in Hebrew, and is thus in all probability a loan-word in Semitic, as also may well be **אלף** and **דלת**, which do not seem to be found in Arabic. The derivations of **גמל, למר, סמך**, too, are quite uncertain. Of the names of the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet a very considerable number would appear to be non-Semitic—a state of things

which speaks eloquently against a Semitic invention of the alphabet, though not necessarily against their development of it.¹

There is still another point which calls for attention. The impression formed after reading histories of the Phoenicians is that they were a people who traded far and near, both learning and teaching at the same time, and ingratiating themselves with the nations—in fact, a people welcomed everywhere and known everywhere. Such being the case, we would expect repeated reference to them in the early records of the various countries with which they came into so close contact. Such a people as the Phoenicians could not possibly be ignored. As a matter of fact, these records know nothing about the Phoenicians. A few references to the inhabitants of individual towns in Phoenicia occur in the Old Testament and in the Babylonian-Assyrian inscriptions. It has been thought that “Sidonians” was used as a general designation for

¹ The theory, originated by De Rougé, of the origin of the alphabet from the Egyptian hieratic writing, still finds, amongst others, a warm supporter in Halévy. A Babylonian origin has long been advocated by Assyriologists. Recently, Winckler and Hommel, working quite independently, have both come to the conclusion that the alphabet has an astral origin, and that it is to this quarter that we must look for the explanations of the names of the letters (*vide Alt. Orient.*, III. 1² (1904), p. 14.) Lidzbarski (*Ephemeris*, 1902, p. 134) contends that the so-called Phoenician alphabet was invented about the twelfth century, B.C. by a Canaanite with only a very imperfect acquaintance with the Egyptian system of writing. In place of the names קוף, נון, גימל, וולח, he would substitute, קשת (bow), נחש (snake), גרן (axe), דר (breast). The forms of the names of the letters, as they appear in the various Semitic dialects, have been examined and contrasted by Nöldeke (*Beitr. z. semit. Sprachw.*, 1904, pp. 124 ff.). Whilst pointing out that the final *a* in the Greek names of the letters, is merely a helping vowel for pronunciation, and no argument for a Canaanite origin, he still inclines, with all reserve, to accept the traditional (Phoenician) origin. The theory of an Aegean origin, due as seems in the first place to Evans, is supported by Dussaud (*J. As.*, 1905, pp. 357 ff.), whilst Praetorius (*Urspr. Kanaan. Alphab.* (1906)) believes that the forms of the letters developed from Asianic (Hittite) pictographs—the Cypriote syllabar, as a parallel but distinct development from the same source, giving a clue to the intermediate stages.

Phoenicians, but there is nothing to support such a view. A reference to Phoenicians is sought for in vain in Brahman literature. As regards Egypt, great interest was attached to the discovery in the quarries of Turrah near Cairo of two tablets, on one of which was recorded that the people employed at the opening up of the quarries belonged to the Fenkhu. Two bare notices of the same name are to be found in the inscriptions of Tahutimes III. It was thought that here at last was a long-looked-for reference to the Phoenicians from the Egyptian side. There was naturally much disappointment when Müller [*Asien und Europa*, p. 208 f.] showed that the name was really a general designation for "aliens," thus depriving Egyptologists of what seemed their only reference to the Phoenicians.

In short, the whole Phoenician question presents so many difficulties that one begins to wonder how much the Greeks really did know about the Phoenicians. It is suggested by v. Landau¹ that Homer's presentation of the "Sidonians" may have helped to mould Greek ideas on this subject. It is at least certain that there was no consensus of opinion amongst Greek writers as to the extent of Phoenicia itself. Its boundaries, as given by Herodotus, Scylax, Strabo, Pliny, and Ptolemy differ materially [cf. Meyer, *Ency. Bib.* (Phoenicia)].

But to return to the Javanites! We have tried to show in a preceding part of this article that the Javanites occupy in the history of the early world the very position which Greek traditions have assigned to the Phoenicians. The name Javan, moreover, is found in the records of all the nations with whom the Phoenicians are said to have traded. Of the attainments of these Javanites we learn mainly from Indian sources. They were possessed of a very high culture. Their wide knowledge is specially praised. They excelled in astronomy and navigation. From them, indeed, the first Indian astronomers acquired their knowledge. So well known were they as traders that many of their wares

¹ *Ex Oriente Lux*, I, iv, p. 10.

received their name. Their name too was intimately associated with writing.

Where was the home of the Javanites? It cannot be supposed that the Javanites were a mere wandering race. The culture which they possessed they could never have acquired as wanderers. The question is, where could a people be settled so as to acquire the highest degree of civilization possible in earliest times, and still come into contact with India and Egypt? Evidently only in Babylonia, or South Arabia. It is now well known that in Babylonia dwelt a race who had attained to an advanced state of culture before the Semites came in from the desert and took possession. To this people is ascribed the origin of the cuneiform writing, and hence probably writing in general. Inscriptions in an unknown language, presumably theirs, are found side by side with the Babylonian-Assyrian. It was in Babylonia that the science of astronomy originated. Here flourished art and the epos: here were in existence great civil and political institutions. The people seem to have dwelt together in towns, each with its own ruler. The religion was astral and thus polytheistic. It is not unnatural to believe that this people spread eastwards and westwards, trading and bearing their culture to India and the Mediterranean. The name of this people has not been handed down, so that we run counter to no tradition in suggesting that these predecessors of the Semites were Javanites.

The arrival of the Semites in Babylonia produced many changes. The Semitic language naturally prevailed. The Semites on the other hand absorbed the culture of the conquered, and there is good reason to believe that the advance of civilization in Babylonia received a check. Political changes followed. Instead of the independent townships we find that the whole land was gradually united under one ruler. Since we have no echoes of a conflict, it is reasonable to suppose that the Semites settled amongst the earlier inhabitants of the land and

intermarried with them. From the mingling of races arose a people strong and energetic, eminently suited for conquest.

Let us follow the pre-Semites as they spread to the Mediterranean. The stronghold of the Asia Minor Javanites seems to have been Ionia, whence they scattered amongst the islands and shores. The high state of Ionian civilization is known to all readers of Greek history. Amongst them it, may be noted, reappeared the epos.

A number of the Javanites settled in Phoenicia. As in early Babylonia and Greece, they dwelt in independent towns, and developed that navigation which they had learned on the Lower Euphrates and Persian Gulf. This is quite in accord with Phoenician tradition, which, according to Herodotus [I, 1, 2, VII, 89], fixes their original home on the Persian Gulf—a tradition which Renan [*Hist. d. Langues sémit.*⁵ (1855), p. 183] upholds. The position of these towns in Phoenicia was one of perpetual difficulty and danger. The great powers Egypt and Babylonia, and later Assyria, repeatedly marched victorious armies through the land and levied tribute without ceasing. The Hittites, too, came storming from the north. The towns had no chance to develop. Their rulers were minions of the Egyptian or Babylonian or Hittite kings. There can be no doubt that their proximity to Cyprus was of supreme importance to them during the long years of oppression. Cyprus was almost secure from invasion. No doubt Javanites settled here shortly after their appearance on the coast of the Mediterranean; and here to-day is one of the most interesting fields for the historian and antiquarian. The language concealed by the peculiar Cypriote characters has been identified as Greek. Phoenicia could never have been the centre of trade in early times. If we have to look for it at all in that quarter, we must seek it in Cyprus.

Yet the Phoenician towns must have kept in the forefront of civilization. That was determined for them

by their close contact with Egypt and Babylonia at different times, and with the Aegean through Cyprus. All that was wanting was an opportunity for development. Their chance came about 1200 B. C. Babylonia and Egypt were simultaneously weak. For over 300 years Syria and Palestine were to be free from their tyranny. The impulse to development came with the Israelites, who crossed the Jordan and entered the "promised land" about the end of the twelfth century B. C. What then happened in the case of the Phoenician towns is related in the opening chapters of the Book of Judges—our only source for the history of Phoenicia at this period. "Asher drave not out the inhabitants of Accho, nor the inhabitants of Zidon, &c.; but the Asherites dwelt among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land" [i. 31, 32]. The Israelites, moreover, intermarried with the Canaanites. "The children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites . . . and they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods" [iii. 5, 6]. Nothing could be more explicit. The Semites overran Phoenicia, but were conquered by the civilization of those whom they had vanquished. It was an exact repetition of what had taken place in Babylonia more than 1,000 years before.

As in Babylonia, so in Phoenicia, the mingling of the races made for energy and progress. The Phoenician towns entered on their period of greatest prosperity. The effort towards centralization resulted in the beginning of the glory of Tyre. The language that now prevailed was the Semitic, the language of the conquerors. No great impression was made by the new race on Cyprus. Only the eastern part of the island seems to have been at all Semitized, and we may safely conclude but small impression was made on the Aegean islands and Greece. There was no opportunity for establishing fresh Semitic settlements, though they doubtless traded in Greek waters. Taking the line of least resistance, the expansion

of Phoenicia was towards Carthage and the Western Mediterranean.

Phoenicia's invasion by the Semites, and Phoenicia's period of prosperity, came a few centuries before the awakening of Greece. In a back-eddy, away from the tide of progress that ebbed and flowed between Mesopotamia and Egypt, a great civilization lay slumbering amidst the Greek islands and shores. Long ere Greek historians commenced to write, Phoenicia had taken and held the leading place in the world's trade, and in the development of culture. It is not surprising that Greek writers attached so much importance to the Phoenicians. This mongrel race, speaking a Semitic language, had no doubt inherited traditions to which they had but half a right. Before the epoch which saw the beginning of Grecian records, the industries, trade, talent, and enterprise of the Phoenicians must have become a tradition. In how far, indeed, the Phoenicians were responsible for the awakening of Greek civilization, it would be difficult to say. They may have taught the Greeks much. They probably did so; but it is impossible to believe that when the Semitic-speaking Phoenicians appeared in the Aegean they found these peoples, either savage or half-civilized. It is certainly hard to imagine that Arabs wandered, settled, and taught amongst these islands in very early times; but it seems probable that the Semitic Phoenicians made their first appearance there about the time of Homer.

E. ROBERTSON.